DC9BKURT1 Trial UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 -----x 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 S1 12 Cr. 376 (RMB) V. 5 RUDY KURNIAWAN, a/k/a "Dr. Conti," a/k/a "Mr. 47," 6 Defendant. 7 -----x December 9, 2013 8 4:04 p.m. 9 Before: 10 HON. RICHARD M. BERMAN, 11 District Judge 12 13 **APPEARANCES** 14 PREET BHARARA, United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 15 JASON P. HERNANDEZ, JOSEPH FACCIPONTI, 16 Assistant United States Attorneys 17 WESTON, GARROU & MOONEY JEROME MOONEY Attorneys for defendant 18 BY: JEROME MOONEY 19 VERDIRAMO & VERDIRAMO, P.A. 20 Attorneys for defendant BY: VINCENT S. VERDIRAMO 21 - also present -22 JAMES WYNNE, Special Agent FBI 23 ARIEL PLATT, Paralegal ADAM ROESER, Special Agent FBI 24 25

(In open court; jury present)

THE COURT: While we're waiting, I'm going to ask the jurors to raise their right hands and Christine will give you an oath as to the performance of your duty as jurors.

(A jury of 12 and two alternates was impanelled and sworn)

THE COURT: So, jurors, what I'm planning to do is I'm going to give you some preliminary jury instructions and then I'll have one or two more for you before you leave today. And then I think we'll at least begin with opening statements. So we're moving along quite nicely.

So now that you've been sworn in as jurors, let me tell you briefly about your duty and give you these, what we call preliminary instructions. It's at the end of the presentation of the evidence, hopefully next week, toward the end of next week, that it will be my responsibility to give you the final charges and it will be your duty to decide from the evidence what the facts are. You and you alone are the judges or the determiners of the facts in this case. So you'll hear the evidence, decide what the facts are, and then apply those facts to the law which I will give you. And that's how you reach your verdict. In doing so, you must follow the law whether you agree with it or not.

As I said before, earlier, and you probably know, under the law a defendant is presumed to be innocent and he or

she cannot be found guilty of the crimes charged in the indictment unless a jury, having heard all of the evidence in the case, unanimously decides that the evidence proves his or her guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

In a criminal case, such as this one, the burden of proof remains with the prosecution. In order for the jury to return a verdict of guilty, the prosecution must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a defendant is guilty. A person charged with a crime has absolutely no burden to prove that he or she is not guilty. And you must not take anything that I saw or do during the trial as indicating what your verdict should be. For example, don't be influenced by my taking notes. What I write down may have nothing to do with this trial or with what you'll be concerned with at the trial.

And, by the way, I have no problem with the jury taking notes. And, in fact, we'll be handing out pads for you and pens if you need to take notes a little bit later.

So let's talk a little bit about evidence and what is not evidence, and then a little bit about burden of proof and then we'll start. So you decide what the facts are from the evidence that will be presented here in court. And that evidence may consist of the testimony of witnesses, documents, and other things received into evidence as exhibits and any facts on which the lawyers may agree or stipulate or that I may instruct you to find.

There's two kinds of evidence: One is called direct, and the other is called circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence is testimony by a witness about what that witness personally saw or heard or did, and circumstantial evidence is indirect evidence; that is, it is proof of one or more facts by which you can find another fact.

You may consider, by the way, both direct and circumstantial evidence in deciding this case. The law permits you to give equal weight to both kinds of evidence, or no weight if that's what you determine, because it's up to you to decide how much weight, if any, to give any particular evidence. As the sole determiners of the facts, you, the jurors, must determine which of the witnesses you believe, what portion of their testimony you accept, and what weight you attach to it.

At times during the trial, I may sustain objections to questions asked. And when that happens, I will not permit the witness to answer; or if the witness, as sometimes happens, has already answered, I will instruct that the answer be stricken from the record and that you, the jurors, disregard it and dismiss it from your minds.

In reaching your decision, you may not draw any inference from an unanswered question where an objection has been sustained, nor may you consider testimony that I have ordered stricken from the record if that happens. The law

requires that your decision be made solely upon the evidence

before you. The items I exclude from your consideration will be excluded because they are not legally admissible as evidence.

The law does not, however, require you to accept all of the evidence that I do admit. In determining what evidence you will accept, you must make your own evaluation of the testimony given by each of the witnesses and each of the documents presented to you and you determine the weight you choose to give each witness's testimony or to an exhibit. There's no magical formula by which you should evaluate testimony or exhibits. I will, however, give you some guidelines for determining the credibility of witnesses at the end of the case.

At this time, suffice it to say that you bring with you to this courtroom all of the experience and background of your lives. You do not leave your common sense outside the courtroom. And so the same types of assessments that you use in everyday dealings are the same assessments or the same type of assessments that you apply in your deliberations.

Just a minute on what is not evidence. The questions and objections of the attorneys are not evidence and neither is any testimony that I may instruct you to disregard.

The statements and arguments of the attorneys during any part of the trial are also not evidence. And, further,

anything that you may see or hear when the Court is not in session, even if what you see or hear were to be done or said by one of the parties or one of the witnesses, that would not be evidence. Only what is admitted into evidence here in court, when court is in session and when all of the parties and all of the jurors are present, is competent evidence.

So I'm going to have a few more instructions for you. Well, I'll give you one more now. We talked about this before. We talked about burden of proof. So now I'll just ask you to remember that this is a criminal case. The standard by which you will assess the evidence is proof beyond a reasonable doubt, and I will in my final charges or instructions to you instruct you more fully on the meaning of the phrase "burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt."

So just a word about how the trial will unfold, the stages. First, we'll hear from counsel first for the government and then for the defense. Opening statements. They don't have to make opening statements, but they usually do. An opening statement is not evidence. It's an outline of what that party intends to prove at trial and it's offered to help you follow the evidence that is presented.

Next, the prosecutor will present witnesses and the defense may cross-examine those witnesses, and then the defense may, but does not have to, present witnesses and the prosecutor may cross-examine those witnesses if the defense does call

3 4

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

witnesses.

Possibly, but not necessarily, I may permit the prosecutor to present additional witnesses to rebut the defendant's evidence, if any. And after that the attorneys will make their closing arguments to summarize and give you their interpretation of what the evidence showed. prosecutor will go first, defense counsel second, and then the prosecutor may get a brief reply to the defense. And like opening statements, closing statements are not evidence. And after those final closing statements or summations, I will give you instructions on the law and then you will retire to deliberate on your verdict.

So please don't make up your mind about what the verdict should be until after I have instructed you on the law at the very end of the case and you have gone to the jury room and you and your fellow jurors have discussed the evidence. please keep an open mind until then. Both parties deserve, and the law requires, that you give them an opportunity to be fully heard.

And so now I'll turn to the government for their opening statement.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Your Honor, may we move the podium to the middle of the jury box?

THE COURT: Absolutely. Can you do it?

I think we can manage. MR. HERNANDEZ:

[ ( I

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

1516

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

(Pause)

MR. HERNANDEZ: Judge, none of this is plugged in, so I can speak loudly. That's not a problem unless your Honor wants to take the time to have it connected.

THE COURT: It's up to you. If you're comfortable without it, that's fine. And, incidentally— well, we'll talk about that later.

MR. HERNANDEZ: May I, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, sure.

MR. HERNANDEZ: This is a case about greed. For years, Rudy Kurniawan, the defendant, the man who's sitting right there, made millions of dollars selling what he claimed were some of the rarest and most expensive wines in the world. He claimed the wines were very old, very special, and made by famous winemakers in France. But those were lies.

Many of the wines that Kurniawan sold weren't rare wines from famous French winemakers as he said they were, but phony knockoffs that Kurniawan made in his own kitchen in a suburb of Los Angeles. There, in his house, he took old, empty wine bottles and he made them look like old, rare bottles. Using a computer and a laser printer, Kurniawan created what looked like antique labels from some of the most famous wineries in France, and he put them on empty bottles in his kitchen and then he filled those bottles with cheap wine and he sold them for thousands of dollars each by tricking people into

OZZIDET

thinking the bottles were very rare and very valuable.

Kurniawan did it over and over again, making millions of dollars from his fraud. But that wasn't enough for Rudy Kurniawan. Although he made millions from selling his phony rare wines, he wanted even more money to fund his lavish lifestyle, so he told a pack of lies to convince a company to lend him \$3 million. The company was called Fine Art Capital. And Kurniawan lied about how much debt he was in, how much money he spent, and he even lied about his immigration status here in the United States.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to take some time now to explain to you how Rudy Kurniawan committed these two frauds. During this trial, you're going to learn that certain famous wines, often older wines from France, are usually sold at wine auctions. And you'll learn that their value is determined by a number of factors, such as the prestige of the winery that made the wine, the year or the vintage of the wine, and where the grapes used to make the wine come from.

The popularity of these collectible wines have substantially increased in the last 15 years, and as a result collectors are willing to pay top dollar for these wines. Rudy Kurniawan took advantage of the surge in wine prices by converting his house in Arcadia, California, a suburb of Los Angeles, into a wine counterfeiting laboratory that pumped out case after case of fake bottles that he dreamed up.

Kurniawan created an assembly line in his kitchen where bottles passed through different stages of being made into counterfeit bottles. He even blocked the kitchen window so that no one could see him soaking the labels off of bottles that he put into the sink and so that no one could see what he was doing. There, in his kitchen, he produced worthless bottles that later he claimed falsely were precious rare wines.

After Kurniawan soaked the labels off of the bottles, he used his computer and printer to make fake wine labels.

Kurniawan even perfected the process by taking notes on how to make them look more authentic. Kurniawan had hundreds of custom rubber stamps made that he used to make fake wine corks to dupe anyone who opened one of his bogus wine bottles and examined or looked at the cork.

After preparing the fake bottles, Kurniawan blended the fake wine to go into the bottles. He used old, low-quality French wines and a blend of younger wines from places like California to make the wines that he thought could pass for very expensive, authentic wines. And to help him keep track of what he was making, he took notes on the actual bottles. He wrote formulas for mixing up different wines to trick his victims into thinking they were drinking genuine fine wines. And Kurniawan used a classic bait-and-switch scam to gain his victims' trust. He regularly opened tens of thousands of dollars of wine, authentic wine, for other collectors at

dinners and at tastings. Kurniawan also paid huge wine bills worth tens of thousands of dollars at restaurants for other collectors.

Kurniawan's victims trusted him so much that when

Kurniawan told collectors that some of his rare wines came from
a quote/unquote magic cellar in Europe, they believed him.

Kurniawan's seeming generosity, however, was just part of the
scam. The magic cellar was just another lie. Kurniawan then
sold these fake bottles at wine auctions held here in Manhattan
and in other places, and he also sold fake wine directly to his
own friends. Over time, however, more and more people were
figuring out that Kurniawan was the source of a huge amount of
fake wine. People got smart and they figured out that any wine
that came from him had to be looked at very carefully.

So what did he do? What did Mr. Kurniawan do? He figured out a new way to deceive his victims: By paying another person to sell his counterfeit wines for him at auctions.

Now, why did he do it? Greed. Kurniawan loved living the high life and he loved the attention that came from having such a supposedly incredible wine collection, even if it meant defrauding his own friends and collectors. He had an unquenchable thirst for luxury cars, designer clothes, and the finest food and drink in the world. And despite raking in millions from his fake wine sales, it wasn't enough.

Opening - Mr. Hernandez

So in late 2007 and early 2008, Kurniawan concocted new lies and a new fraud. This time Kurniawan targeted Fine Art Capital. That's a company here in Manhattan that specializes in giving loans to people who want to secure their loans with art, fine wine, or other collectibles.

So in late 2007 Kurniawan applied for, and received, a \$3 million loan from Fine Art Capital. To get that loan,
Kurniawan told Fine Art Capital several big lies. The first
lie that Rudy Kurniawan told was about how much debt he had.
Kurniawan lied to the tune of millions of dollars of debt that
he knew he had, but he hid from Fine Art Capital.

Second, Kurniawan lied about how much money he spent each year. He claimed that he spent about \$150,000 a year, but Kurniawan knew that was false because he spent millions of dollars more than that each year.

And, third, he lied about his immigration status here in the United States. He claimed that he was a permanent resident who was applying for a green card. But he knew that was a lie too, because an immigration court had ordered Kurniawan to self-deport; that is, to leave the country voluntarily in March of 2003.

So now I'm going to take some time to explain to you the charges in this case and how we're going to prove to you that Rudy Kurniawan is as guilty as charged.

Rudy Kurniawan is charged with committing two crimes:

In Count One, he's charged with committing mail fraud by creating, selling, and trying to sell counterfeit wines. Countwo charges him with committing wire fraud for defrauding Fine Art Capital, by lying to them and omitting important information to them when he applied for a \$3 million loan.

We are going to prove to you that Rudy Kurniawan was making counterfeit wine with evidence from his house. As I mentioned previously, you will get to see, and you will get to hold in your hands, thousands of wine labels, corks, stamps and other things that he used to make counterfeit bottles that was retrieved from his home. Kurniawan's computers, you will see, were full of hundreds of scanned and manipulated images of wine labels. The images show how Kurniawan airbrushed or Photoshopped aspects of labels so that he could print them at will and use them to deceive buyers to make them think they were buying authentic rare wines.

We will show you how Kurniawan turned his computer and printer into a virtual ATM machine that printed out thousand dollar bills in the form of fake wine labels. The evidence in this trial will also include several of the fake bottles that Kurniawan sold and tried to sell at wine auctions here in Manhattan and in other places.

You're also going to hear from several witnesses during this trial, such as the victims who bought Kurniawan's fake wines. And you're going to hear from some French

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

14

winemakers who will tell you why the wines that Kurniawan sold I expect one of those winemakers to tell you that are fake. Kurniawan even tried to sell dozens of bottles of wine that his winery never even made. I expect this witness will tell you that when he confronted the defendant, Rudy Kurniawan, and asked Kurniawan where he got the obvious fakes from, Kurniawan told another bald-faced lie. Kurniawan told the winemaker that he got the bottles from a collector in Indonesia and that he gave the winemaker two phone numbers in Indonesia for this supposed winemaker, for this supposed collector. The numbers, however, were a dead end. There was no Indonesian collector. The bottles didn't come from Indonesia. They came from Southern California. It was just another one of Kurniawan's lies. It was more of the magic.

I also expect a witness from Fine Art Capital to say that Fine Art Capital would not have approved the \$3 million loan if Fine Art Capital had known that Rudy Kurniawan was lying. I expect that witness will tell you that Kurniawan defaulted on the loan and Fine Art Capital had to sell their collateral, the collateral it had, to get its money back.

The charges in this case are also going to be supported by documents. We'll present to you e-mails that show just how desperate Rudy Kurniawan was for money and how he ordered supplies, like wax to seal the tops of wine bottles, for his counterfeiting enterprise. There are going to be

invoices showing Kurniawan's purchases of huge quantities of old, cheap French wines that he used to mix up into his fake bottles. We're going to show you bank records that showed that he made millions from his scheme and also that he spent millions.

Ladies and gentlemen, over the next several days, we are going to be presenting you with all of the evidence that I just mentioned and more. And at the end of the trial, the case is going to go to you, the jury, to decide whether the government has met its burden of proving the charges beyond a reasonable doubt. And before I conclude, I'm going to ask you all to do three things.

First, is to listen carefully to all of the evidence in this case. It's going to come in in bits and pieces, but at the end we'll put it altogether for you.

Second, listen to Judge Berman's instructions on the law carefully.

And, third, use your common sense. It's the same common sense that you use in your lives every day as New Yorkers.

And if you do those three things, you will see that the only verdict that is consistent with the facts and the law is that on both counts of the indictment, Rudy Kurniawan is quilty.

Thank you.

25

16

1 THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel. 2 Mr. Mooney. 3 MR. MOONEY: Thank you, your Honor. 4 Can I move this out of the way? 5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Sure. 6 MR. MOONEY: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, 7 Counsel, if it please the Court, my name is Jerome Mooney and with my co-counsel, Vincent Verdiramo, we represent Rudy 8 9 Kurniawan. 10 Rudy, stand up, please. Thank you. 11 We're going to be here with you for a couple of weeks 12 and we'll be talking to you about this case and about the 13 things that went on over a period of time dating back to the 14 early part of 2000. 15 Now, first of all, I know this is a really, really difficult time of year. There's a lot that's going on in 16 17 everybody's life. And I want to let you know that we appreciate very much your being here and your taking this 18 time -- not that you had a lot of choice in it -- but that 19 20 you're taking this time to come out here and perform this 21 really important task and this role. It's important. It's 22 important to everybody. It's important to all of us here. 23 I know I had a juror talk to me after a trial one

entire life. He said, I've never won anything, but I did get picked for jury duty so I guess I've got a perfect record. And I suppose that all of you are just about in that same spot, sitting here wondering, Oh, boy, why me? But we do appreciate it. What we do can't work without you. You are the foundation of our system. It just can't work.

Now, you're going to hear a lot of evidence over the course of the next couple of weeks. The government's going to start out, first of all, with all of the evidence they've got and it's appropriate that they will, because they have the burden of proof. We're not going to put a lot of witnesses on because most of the witnesses that will come in, that the government will put on initially, are going to be the same folks that we're going to be asking questions. So we'll try and give you the information that you need pretty much from that.

A lot of the exhibits that you see, the majority of those exhibits, are going to be marked with yellow stickers for the government. We'll be entering a good number of those. The government has collected and put together most of the documents that will be helpful. So don't pay any attention when you see an exhibit as to whether it says it's a prosecution or a defense exhibit. It's an exhibit. Once it's entered into evidence, it becomes evidence that you can use once the judge says that's in the case. Whose sticker happens to be on it

doesn't mean anything. Just like who calls the witness doesn't mean anything. What matters is what's proven in this case and what's not proven in this case.

Now, there's only two counts that Mr. Kurniawan is charged with, two things that we're going to face. The second one is the so-called fraud against Fine Art Capital. And I just want to mention a little bit about what I think you're going to learn with regard to that. Yes, he went down and got a \$3 million loan. He got a \$3 million loan from Fine Art Capital because he had taxes that he needed to pay. Not exactly terribly greedy.

And you're also going to hear that in the course of getting his \$3 million loan— and, by the way, he only gets two and a half million of it. They hold back half a million against cost and fees. So out of the two and a half million, for the two and a half million dollars that he actually gets on the loan, he pledges security which you're going to hear that Fine Art Capital valued at \$6.8 million. So he gives them \$6.8 million worth of property for the purposes of getting two and a half million dollars that he can then use for some of the other expenses and things that he's got. I suppose that might be a fraudulent scheme, but I think it's important for you to remember that. Keep that in mind when you see it.

Rudy is a young man, he's of Chinese descent, born in Indonesia. That's important because as a young Chinese man in

Opening - Mr. Mooney

DC9BKURT1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Indonesia, he starts life as kind of an outsider. It's very difficult to be a Chinese person in that country, and his family has always had certain problems. Even though they've always been successful, they've always been outsiders in Indonesia. So he grew up being an outsider.

He came to the United States to get an education, got his education, and in the course of what he was doing here became acquainted with fine wines. And wine is something which is meant to be drunk. It's designed. It's a biological product that's created for the purposes of being consumed. Because unlike a Picasso that you may hang up on your wall and sit back and enjoy, it's not going to last forever. It needs to be consumed and it needs to be consumed within a certain period of time.

Now, some of us have better palates with regard to this than others. It turns out that Rudy had a very good palate. As he started to experience and taste wines, he found out that he could really distinguish between different tastes, that he could really appreciate the differences in wines. You hear about some of those people that can taste a wine and they can tell you where it came from and tell you what the year is and tell you all about what's in the bottle. And he's one of those people. I'm not. I know some of it, but I can't do that. But he can.

So because he had a pretty good palate, he suddenly

starts getting introduced to other people, people who are very much into this whole thing of drinking and consuming and having these very, very fine wines.

Now, he comes from a wealthy family. So he came over here, he's got money, but he started to meet these people and he wants to belong. He's always wanted to belong. Now here's this group of people that are enjoying something that he really likes too.

So he starts to be able to go to some places where these people are. He starts to be able to taste and drink some of the wines that they've got. And we're talking about some of the richest people in the world because some of these wines cost a great deal of money. If you're going to spend a thousand dollars on something, a bottle of wine, you open it up, you pour it and drink it, that's not normal people. Those are people with lots of money. And he meets these people.

Now, they're richer than he is, they're older than he is, and for the most part they're more successful than he is. He's just a young man. He comes from a rich family. He's graduated from college.

But he wants to be part of what they are, so he starts to go places where he can be with them. He starts to do things to try to figure out how he can be a part of this group.

You'll hear that he takes these people to fancy, expensive restaurants and he buys expensive wines for them to drink and

he pays for the meal. Pays for the whole meal for some of the richest people on earth. And you're going to hear that they're not buying him dinner. He's buying them dinner. Even though they're wealthy billionaires, he's buying them dinner. Why is he doing that? He wants to be part of what's going on.

He also then starts to get involved in some of the auctions and things that are going on with regards to the buying of the product, and he becomes known as the most prolific buyer of wines that are out there. And he buys not hundreds of dollars' worth, not thousands of dollars' worth, but millions of dollars in wine. That's what he buys. And he's buying it almost as quick as he can get his hands on it. He's going to the auctions and getting it because that starts to make him maybe — maybe if he has enough, maybe if he can get this all together, maybe they'll let him be part of this club. Maybe he'll be in. Maybe he'll be the friend that Mr. Hernandez says that he is to these other people. Maybe. Maybe these older, richer people that he's buying all these dinners for and spending all this money on, maybe they will let him be a friend if he rises up to that level.

But you're going to hear something else about the wine market. You're going to hear that in the wine market, there's a lot of counterfeits and there's a lot of alterations. Old bottles get bad labels, labels get replaced, people replace labels, people uncork them when they shouldn't, they recork

them. Because for most of the time it was just really about drinking it. And you're going to hear that that goes on. And you're going to hear even from the people that come in from the French chateaus, yeah, there's an awful lot of bottles out there that are counterfeit. And if you're out there buying a lot, if you're buying a lot of wine, you're going to buy a lot of counterfeits. It's just going to happen.

Now, Mr. Kurniawan, Rudy, who first starts getting involved in any capacity in wines in the early 2000s, starts to— he's going to tell people, Oh, I know the difference, I can tell. And probably when it comes to opening a bottle and tasting it, he can. But you're going to have experts that are going to come in here and these experts are going to talk to you about all of these bottles. And just wait and see how much time and energy some of these people have put into it and how complicated and difficult it is sometimes to figure out all of the differences.

So, what Mr. Hernandez told you to do, I'm going to ask you to do as well. Pay attention. Pay close attention to what's going on and listen to things. Try not to reach any quick conclusions, because you need to get the whole big picture of what's happening before you can really start to put it in the right perspective, before you can see that this poor guy ends up being the one who suddenly gets blamed for everything. When people get embarrassed, when all of this

begins to come out in the press, when people start making a big thing about the fact of, oh, look at all these counterfeits. Yes, there are lots and lots of counterfeits. He bought counterfeits, he sold counterfeits. Everybody else bought counterfeits and sold counterfeits. But because he's not one of the insiders, we're here. And he's the one that some of these people are going to want you to believe is responsible for all of the awful, horrible things that have happened with regards to the wine market.

And I think at the end of the case you're going to be able to look at it and you're going to be able to see it and you're going to be able to see that everything that has been put together with regards to this so-called case is just a house of cards and it doesn't really stand up.

I'm going to thank you now. I don't get a chance-- we don't get a chance to address you now until after all of the evidence is in and we get to the end of the case.

I want to mention one other thing. We'll, a lot of times as we go on, I know this is going to get really boring for you and you're going to hear us ask a lot of questions sometimes and say, Why on earth is he asking that question? We certainly know that already.

One of the really frustrating things that happens in a trial, and it's frustrating for both of us, the frustrating part for you guys is you're sitting there, the witness is up

there and the witness is talking about something and you want to know something from that witness. Well, you don't get to raise your hand and say, Well, what about this? And that's going to be really frustrating for you.

I'm going to tell you right now that's going to be really, really frustrating. But you know what? It's really, really frustrating for us, too, because we're sitting here thinking what's that question that they want answered? So we're trying to figure that out and we're trying to remember what it is.

Sometimes we'll get it right. Sometimes we'll think about it and we'll ask the question and we'll get you the information that you need. Sometimes we won't and the witness will be done and the witness will be gone and you'll be mad at us because we never asked the question.

So I'm going to apologize for that right now. And especially because we'll probably ask about 15 other questions that you wish we didn't ask because you say that's obvious. because we're asking all those questions because we're trying to get to the one that we think that's the one that you're really trying to hear about.

So let me apologize for all of those sorts of things that are going to happen right now. I mean I could just tell you that's going to happen. It's frustrating for all of us. We'll do the best that we can to try to figure out what those

questions are. We'll do our best to try to ask those questions. We'll do the best that we can to try to get you that information.

Then, when all of the evidence is in and we're done, we'll get a chance to do this again. And at that point in time, I can try to tie it altogether and bring it together so you can at least see what I think I saw and hopefully that will be the same thing that you will see.

So, once again, thank you very much. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay, ladies and gentlemen. I'm going to let you go in a couple of minutes. I want to give you some instructions and also about conducting yourselves as jurors and also about tomorrow, because starting tomorrow we're going to do all this trial in Room 12D. So it's a smaller courtroom. It's a little warmer, in fact, and I see people are happy about that. It's 12D.

So here are the conduct instructions. First, I ask that you not talk to each other about this case or about anyone who has anything to do to do with it until the very end of the case when you go to the jury room to decide or to deliberate on your verdict.

Second, I asked you not to talk with anyone else about the case or about anyone who has anything to do with it until the trial has ended and you have been discharged as jurors.

And, by the way, when I say "talk," I mean e-mailing,

texting, Tweeting, blogging, et cetera. Not just verbal communication, but all forms of communications. I'm asking you not to do that. I'm referring to any type of communication in any form, including Facebook, MySpace, Twitter, et cetera.

Additionally, I ask you not to remain in the presence of other persons who may be discussing this case either face-to-face, orally, or on-line. And anyone else includes members of your family and your friends and includes social media. So you may say to your family or your friends that you're a juror in a case, but don't tell them anything else about the case until after you have been discharged by me.

Third, don't let anyone talk -- as broadly defined a minute ago -- to you about the case or about anyone who has anything to do with it. And if someone were to try and talk to you about the case, please report that to Christine or me immediately.

In this regard I should mention that the attorneys and other persons — witnesses, et cetera — involved in the case are not supposed to talk to jurors, even to offer a friendly greeting. So if you happen to run into one of them outside the courtroom, they will— and properly so— ignore you. Please don't take offense. They're only acting properly by doing that.

Fourth, don't read any news or internet stories or articles or blogs or anything or listen to any radio or TV or

internet reports about the case or about anyone who has anything to do with it.

And, fifth, do not do any type of research or any type of investigation about the case on your own.

The bottom line is that the parties are entitled to have you personally render a verdict in this case on the basis of your independent evaluation of the evidence presented in the courtroom. And obviously speaking to others about the case, including your family members, before you deliberate among yourselves or exposing yourself to evidence outside the courtroom in any way would compromise your jury service and fairness to the parties.

So we made very good progress today. We're going to stop for today. Remember, we start early. We start in trial on the 12th floor, Courtroom D, 12D, at 9 a.m. So we'd like you to be here by 8:45. We'll have coffee and tea and some bagels in the jury room. So 8:45 in Room 12D.

Thanks for a great day and we're off to an excellent start.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: You can leave your notes face down on the chair.

THE COURT: Yes, if you leave your notes behind, we'll safeguard them overnight and make sure you get them back tomorrow.

(Jury excused)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(In open court; jury not present)

THE COURT: Okay, folks. Good start. We'll see you at around 8:45, if that's okay.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Judge, just a couple of things before we start in the morning.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Obviously Jim Wynne, the case agent, is going to be sitting at counsel table. I assume that's okay, given normal practice.

And then Michael Egan, who's our expert, we'd like to be able to sit through the trial, listen to the evidence, and then testify at the end.

THE COURT: I have no problem with that.

MR. MOONEY: We would like all other witnesses to be excluded, though, your Honor.

MR. HERNANDEZ: We told all other witnesses not to attend and watch. Now, some of the witnesses have asked if they could watch the trial after they've testified.

THE COURT: That's fine with me.

MR. MOONEY: I think after they've been released.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Right.

MR. MOONEY: There are some of the witnesses -- what I anticipate is we're going to ask that they not be released because there may be things that we may need to call them back for later.

THE COURT: 1 Okay. 2 MR. MOONEY: A good example right now would be Truly 3 Hardy. We'll try to get in what we can, but there may be a 4 possibility that we may need him back. 5 MR. HERNANDEZ: That's definitely something that we should talk about. We're calling Truly Hardy early --6 7 MR. MOONEY: Oh, to get him out of here? Okay. MR. HERNANDEZ: Well, we're not getting him out. He's 8 9 going to an auction in Hong Kong. 10 MR. MOONEY: Well, that's out. Hong Kong is very out. 11 THE COURT: I think you guys will work that out 12 yourselves. If there's any problem, you'll let me know. I 13 think you'll be able to work it out. 14 MR. MOONEY: We'll figure it out. We can go to Hong 15 Kong. 16 THE COURT: All right. We'll see you tomorrow. 17 MR. MOONEY: Thank you, your Honor. (Adjourned to December 10, 2013, at 9:00 a.m.) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25